IMC Meeting Minutes: 07-21-2006

Minutes transcribed by Lauren Latterman – OIT and Elain Radford – OIT.

I. Call to Order: 1:33 pm – Chairman Picanso

IMC Commissioner attendance: Delmonico, Lutz, Malinowski, Marroney, McGimpsey, Monkman, Mulford, Picanso, VanDerSchouw.

Introduction of Commissioners and audience members.

Chairman Picanso announced that a quorum is present.

A.   Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Picanso thanked Vice-Chairman Mulford for serving as Chair of the June IMC Meeting. He informed the Commission that OIT will provide to the August 2006 IMC a formal presentation on the impacts of legislation passed during the FY05-06 legislative session: SB06-063 on project management; SB06-149 on the IMC/OIT; and HB06-1157 on Cyber Security. Chairman Picanso requested the attendance of as many Commissioners and audience members as possible for the August 2006 IMC.

B. Meeting Minutes

Chairman Picanso opened the floor for discussion on the June 16, 2006 IMC Meeting Minutes. No discussion followed, so he requested a motion for approval of the Minutes.

Motion	(Motion: Commissioner Malinowski, 2nd: Commissioner VanDerSchouw)

To approve the meeting minutes for June 16, 2006 IMC meeting.
Approved unanimously.

C. Motions and Action Items

Chairman Picanso called forward Daniel Sullivan, OIT staff, to provide the Commission with a review and discussion of the June 16, 2006 Motions and Action Items list. Daniel facilitated the review and following discussion:

Daniel reported that the Minutes from the May 19, 2006 IMC Meeting were adopted. He further noted that the Commission voted to adopt IT policies for project management and the ADA IT Accessibility Standards.

Action Item #1. Daniel reported that Chairman Picanso will follow up on this item. Chairman Picanso commented that he has plans to speak with Director Rippy regarding an update to the IMC on the Statewide Internet Portal Authority (SIPA).

Action Item #2. Daniel reported this item is in progress and the Commission will receive an update as soon as it is available.

Action Item #3. Daniel reported this item will be completed at the August IMC meeting.

Action Item #4. Daniel reported this item has been completed. The CDHS-DVR RISE project presented to the Risk Management Subcommittee this morning and are on the agenda to present to the full IMC this afternoon.

Action Item #5. Daniel reported this item has been completed. The CDOT ERP project presented to the Risk Management Subcommittee this morning and are scheduled to present to the full Commission in August 2006.

Action Item #6. Daniel reported this item has been completed and noted that there are comments included in the "comment" section of the motion/action items list, which lists the first 5 early adopters in the new Disaster Recovery facility.

Action Item #7. Daniel reported this item has been completed, and though OIT could not send the CDLE update of their meeting with the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) via email, the information is included in the comment section.

Action Item #8. Daniel reported this item has been completed. The DOR CSTARS project provided an update to the Risk Management Subcommittee Meeting this morning. Daniel further reported that this system has not yet been deployed in the counties, however, a list of counties that are up and running will be a part of the CSTARS project monthly status reports in the future.

Action Item #9. Daniel reported this item has been completed and the information is in the comments section.

Action Item #10 Daniel reported this item has been completed. The DPA DTRS Project has been scheduled for a presentation to the full IMC next month.

Commissioner VanDerSchouw pointed out that the June 2006 IMC voted on Minutes and IT Policies and Standards with attendance of seven (7) Commissioners present, not eight (8) that constitute a quorum. He requested the June 2006 Minutes be corrected, if needed.

II. Old Business

A. Projects Readouts (Elain Radford, OIT Staff)

Chairman Picanso noted that they are discussing the possibility of having both the Executive Directors and CIO's of projects who are reporting in "RED" status to come to the IMC and present with their project team. Chairman Picanso asked for further discussion on this matter.

Commissioner Lutz asked if the Chairman was looking for support, commentary, etc? What are we trying to accomplish? Chairman Picanso responded by asking the Commission for a formal vote that would develop a policy as such. Commissioner Lutz commented that it would make sense to have the executive directors be part of the discussion, not just the CIO, and that he believes it is very important to have that level of representation.

Commissioner Marroney concurred with Commissioner Lutz and stated that it is beneficial to have executive directors come before the IMC. In addition, he expressed a concern about how the

executive directors are handled once they are present at an IMC Meeting. Commissioner Marroney expressed his desire to ensure that politics are not involved and that project discussion is solely based on the matter at hand. Commissioner McGimpsey questioned whether this would occur at the initial meeting or at every RED status meeting. Chairman Picanso responded that this would have to be worked out on a case by case basis. Chairman Picanso commented that possibly for projects who have gone from a non-RED status to RED status, the IMC would like to have the executive directors there, but maybe for those who have remained in RED status the executive director would come back every couple of months. OIT will try to get a draft to the Commission by the August meeting.

Commissioner Malinowski stated that it would be good to be very specific as to what we are looking for from the executive director: i.e., is it a question of risks and what they are doing to mitigate those risks? What is their plan to bring the project out of RED status? Chairman Picanso stated that the Risk Management Subcommittee is currently working on a list of standard questions that will be asked of every CIO when they come to present to this subcommittee. He further noted that it might be good to have a similar, shortened, list for the executive directors when they come to the IMC meetings so that they have a good idea of what they will be asked. He went on to say that this might help to keep the discussion from becoming too political. OIT will draft a policy for the August meeting.

Action Item	(Chairman Picanso)

OIT provide a draft policy regarding CIO and executive director participation for initially presenting "RED" status projects to the IMC.

Commissioner Delmonico stated that the Risk Management Subcommittee will work on risk assessment questions for the executive directors.

Chairman Picanso raised the issue of the project reporting structure and the project dashboard: for example, how RED is RED, how YELLOW is YELLOW? Chairman Picanso noted that there has been some debate as to the definition of the colors, and mentioned that he has asked OIT staff to meet to get a better background on the situation and then discuss the findings with the Risk Management Subcommittee. Commissioner Delmonico suggested the possibility of eliminating the use of YELLOW, and just using GREEN and RED.

Chairman Picanso called Elain Radford, OIT staff, forward to present the IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard Report.

1. IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard Report
Elain Radford provided the Commission with a brief update and review of the IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard and noted that the Dashboard reflects the status of each project through July 14, 2006, even though agency project status reports reflect status through the previous month only. Chairman Picanso noted that a challenge is for the IMC Dashboard to report up-to-date project status.

Elain noted that the Dashboard has been reorganized by agency acronym and that three new projects have been added to the Dashboard. She reported that of all the projects on the Dashboard, two projects are currently in RED status and four are in YELLOW status. She further reported that the CDHS-DVR RISE Project is now in RED status which happened within the last 2 weeks. Elain reported that the CDOT ERP Project has been in YELLOW status since January 2006, they presented to the Risk Management Subcommittee this morning, and will present to

the full IMC in August 2006. Elain further noted that the DPA DTRS Project will report to the full IMC in August as well. Two new projects added to the Dashboard are the HCPF HIPAA National Provider Identifier (Rule #5) Project and the HCPF MMIS Reprocurement Project, and both projects will report to the Risk Management Subcommittee in August 2006.

Chairman Picanso opened discussion regarding the current presentation of the IMC Executive Project Dashboard and asked the Commission if it is currently serving everyone's needs or if it should be changed in any way. Commissioner VanDerSchouw responded that he feels it is an issue of the "90% problem" and that the true earned value of the project is missing. Commissioner VanDerSchouw further noted that more tangible methods of assessing the project status are needed. Chairman Picanso noted that OIT would discuss this matter further within the office, as well as with the agencies, regarding project status and metrics.

Action Item	(Chairman Picanso)

OIT continue to evolve the IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard and discuss project status and metrics with agencies.

Commissioner Malinowski asked if Commissioner VanDerSchouw could expand on his statement: is it the expectation that the amount expended should be able to be related in some tangible way to the deliverables? Commissioner VanDerSchouw responded that, typically, there are three major measures of a project: scope, time, and budget. He noted that the problem is that they are all on three different axes and we need to figure out how to show them on the same axis and equate what we paid for with what was received.

Commissioner Delmonico agreed that we have to enhance the Dashboard, and noted that the Risk Management Subcommittee is planning to have a brainstorming session on the subject next month and anyone is welcome to attend.

Commissioner Malinowski asked whether or not we should add the DPA Capitol Complex VOIP (telecommunications lease) Project to the Dashboard. Chairman Picanso replied that this project would be added to the Dashboard.

Elain Radford called forward the DOR HAVA/SCORE Project team to provide an update on the status of their project.

a.) Department of State (CDOS) – HAVA/SCORE Project: Trevor Timmons-Deputy CIO; Scott Lee-IVV; Leigh-Anne McDonald-Project Manager

Trevor Timmons began the discussion by reporting where they are with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)- the federal agency that bears enforcement responsibility with the Help America Vote Act (HAVA). Trevor stated that the Department converses with the DOJ every few weeks and that their next phone call is scheduled for July 28th. He pointed out that they have a couple of focus areas that affect the statewide database of registered voters. He noted that Colorado is not currently in compliance with the Federal law, but the DOJ wants to be sure that Colorado is completing voter verification checks in the meantime, including: keeping track of duplicate registrations, making sure that convicted felons are kept from voting, and ensuring that the deceased are removed from the voter registration forms. Trevor noted that those requirements

are currently being covered in Colorado, being tracked on a monthly basis, and that counties are devoting sufficient resources to these requirements.

Trevor reported that the major focus area for the DOJ regards long-term HAVA compliance. He stated that the DOJ, knowing that Colorado has recently selected a vendor, has offered to provide information from a national perspective that might be useful to Colorado as they work through the contract with the vendor. Trevor also commented that, overall, their interaction with the DOJ has been very cooperative and collaborative. Trevor expressed a special thank you to the OIT staff, in particular John Picanso and Elain Radford, for their help on the recent RFP Committee. Trevor asked Leigh-Anne McDonald to speak about the RFP.

Leigh-Anne pointed out that there has been great progress in June and July and that the schedule does remain on track. She provided a brief recap of recent events as follows: the RFP was released on April 18, 2006, four vendors responded on May 9, 2006 and of those four, two were considered viable and moved to the evaluation phase. Leigh-Anne reported that the RFP evaluation team met in June and the vendors advanced, vendor best and final offers were submitted and received on July 13, 2006 and the evaluation team met again on July 17, 2006 to conduct the final evaluation. Leigh-Anne stated the "notice of intent to award" occurred on July 19, 2006 and SaBER was selected and notified. She commented that the State is currently putting together a contract negotiation team made up of both State and county representatives. Leigh-Anne pointed out that the project has made improvements each month and continues to be on track.

Trevor emphasized that it has been their consistent practice to have the project's IV&V staff present and that an architectural assessment was conducted on both proposals, which required the vendor's chief architect to come into town to meet about their proposal. Trevor recognized Scott Lee as the project's IV&V staff.

Scott Lee pointed out the due diligence that took place and how they took advantage of lessons learned from the previous project. He further stated that the reference checks went deeper than most projects and that risks have been identified and will be watched as the project progresses.

b.) Department of Revenue (CDOR) – CSTARS Project: Brett Mueller, CIO

Brett Mueller provided an update on the CSTARS Project and started with a brief background on the system, training and when the Department expects to deploy this system. He reported that all of the hardware has either been procured, ordered, or is on the ground ready to be configured or pre-configured. Brett stated that all 107 county offices will be receiving new hardware and servers, and that desktop stations are also getting pre-configured.

To address some the questions that arose last month, Brett reported that, with the help of DoIT, all 107 counties are connected by T1 link back to the state offices on the MNT. He stated that the application is in a fully ready mode; there are currently no open severity 1 defects to the application; and full regression testing was completed last month, which yielded a few defects, that have been opened, fixed and closed. Brett emphasized that next month, they expect to finish final preparations and get ready to go live at State offices.

Commissioner Marroney asked if they were going to do data conversion from the old system to the new system. Brett confirmed that it will be a phased approach and explained that the two systems will have to be synched up every 24 hours and run in tandem for a period of time.

Commissioner McGimpsey asked if there were any severity two or three issues that they are concerned with. Brett responded that there are a number of severity two bugs and defects but that the vendor would be working on them and all would be fixed by deployment.

Commissioner Lutz asked if Brett could discuss their current or future relationship with the Portal. Brett responded that there are projected external interfaces to provide services but they have to go live in their first counties before that can be done.

c.) Department of Labor and Employment (CDLE) – *genesis* PRA Project: Steve Uretsky, CIO

Steve Uretsky asked if it would be appropriate for the Risk Management Subcommittee to report on what was discussed in the morning meeting. Commissioner Delmonico responded that from an assessment perspective, the project is on track and there is a list of task items. From the Subcommittee perspective, she noted that they would like to wait and see what the assessment would be. Commissioner Delmonico stated there is a degree of transparency present and that the Department has provided more communication, and commented that from an IMC perspective they have a greater level of detail. She also noted that the quality of that assessment and the next steps would be important.

Steve stated that in April 2006 the JBC approved $500k for the project and on June 20, 2006 the JBC approved the remaining 1.8 million for a total of 2.3 million dollars. Steve reported that one of the biggest efforts so far is the procurement of external staff to supplement their own staff, and emphasized that there is a period of about 2 months to accomplish this. He pointed out that the monthly status report lists both a high level budget and high-level milestones. Steve stated there are approximately 15 procurements that need to be done for various skill sets: 1/3 will be using the State Pricing Agreement, 2/3 with the documented quote process, and one of the procurements would utilize the sole source methodology. Steve reported that they are working with a more aggressive schedule than previously thought and, as a result, may miss their procurement schedule by a week or so.

Steve reported that the initial costs did not include funding for operational expenses. He stated they have settled on a space that they have already leased, and will be moving people around so there will be dedicated space for the team. Steve emphasized that because they are using existing space, the financial impact will be minimal and they should be able to absorb the cost. Steve mentioned that, with regard to procurement, they are trying to mitigate issues by involving stakeholders such as OIT and the PMO all the way through the process. He also stated that, at the project's "kick-off meeting", the department's executive director, Rick Grice, reiterated the importance of transparency with the project, and to that end they have a draft communication plan in place as part of the project plan. Steve also emphasized that when the funding was approved by the JBC, as a footnote, the team is required to send regular reports to the JBC.

Commissioner Mulford asked what kind of mix there is on the team between members of the previous project and new personnel. Steve responded that, based on the number of hours

assigned to CDLE staff versus external staff, the number of external staff is around 34% but there are also some members of the CDLE staff that did not participate very much with the project before. The majority of the CDLE staff, however, did work with the project previously. Steve further mentioned that the best way to approach the Sole Source procurement, as previously mentioned, is to use SysTest as the IV&V since they did well the first time and already know the department.

d.) Department of Human Services-DVR (CDHS) – RISE Project: Ron Huston-CIO, John Daurio-Regional Manager, Len Vest-IVV

Ron Houston provided an update on the status of the RISE Project and reported that on July 12, 2006, the RISE Project went into RED status for the 2nd time. Ron stated that the reason for this is due to staffing issues and missed deliverables by the vendor. He explained that the vendor has 3 significant staffing issues: 1) who the project director was, 2) a number of staff that had not been acquired who possessed the proper experience or skill, and 3) the Project Manager who had to be let go. Ron further explained that, to date, there are 12 deliverables that the vendor has not completed, and that, even before the project went into YELLOW status, they could see that the vendor was not following through.

Ron stated that he and John Daurio arranged to meet with an individual who had been presenting himself as the President of the company on June 27, 2006. Ron emphasized that John Picanso was also invited to join the meeting and they conveyed to the individual that they were considering a termination letter. Further, the vendor was given a due date for when they wanted actions taken. Ron reported that since that meeting the vendor has hired a new project director and the team is pleased with what they have seen so far. Ron further reported that the vendor had planned on firing their project manager, however, the RISE team did not agree with action and the project manager was kept on.

Ron stated that, in terms of the project deliverables, the vendor worked with the project team to come up with a recovery plan. Out of this plan, the first deliverable was due July 20, 2006 and accepted, while some of the previous deliverables had been found unacceptable and denied. He emphasized that between now and August 15, 2006, there are 20 deliverables due by the vendor. Ron further noted that the Department has prepared a default letter that reiterates the demands already made of the organization and to reemphasize that the recovery plan developed is to be met. If these are not met, Ron stated that a termination letter will be sent out that has already been approved by the attorney general's office.

Ron reported that the team has recently learned that the individual who presented himself as the President of the company is in fact the President of the U.S. Division. He further noted that he believes they have determined who the real President is and plan to meet with him next week. Further, the default letter will be modified to address the President. Ron stated that, after numerous meetings with John Daurio as well as OIT, it is the Department's intent to give the vendor one more opportunity to succeed. He commented that the support for the project has been extremely strong from the staff and that the number one issue at hand is the users on the system.

John Daurio noted that 20% of their workforce is actively involved with the project on an on-going basis and they are committed to, as well as vested in, the success of the project. He

emphasized that the staff is committed to the success of the project with or without HCL (the vendor).

Commissioner Marroney asked if the State already had built into the RFP process the requirement for an organizational chart as well as fiscal and financial information of the company. He further questioned if there was a misrepresentation as to the organizational chart or if one was simply not provided. Ron Huston replied that this is something they are currently trying to figure out, and should be accomplished in the next week.

Commissioner Malinowski asked Ron what the conditions might be that would cause termination of the contract. Ron responded that, now that they are aware that another level of escalation exists, they plan to escalate the problem first.

Commissioner McGimpsey asked if they were dealing with a subsidiary of HCL out of India and when the last payment had been made to them. Ron responded that it is a subsidiary out of India and the last payment made was in January 2006. Commissioner McGimpsey then asked what the back-up plan would be if the vendor did default. Ron responded that nothing is concrete at this point. He commented that, unfortunately, time and money are a factor in State government projects, and pointed out how long it would take to terminate the contract and then get another vendor on board. Ron further stated that the cost it would take to do this is their largest motivator to demand that the company follow through.

Commissioner Delmonico interjected that HCL was not previously involved in the project - they were only recently brought in. She emphasized that, as mentioned in the Risk Management Subcommittee, by next month they would know one way or another where the project is heading.

Commissioner Lutz asked if the staffing issues were local or issues in the development shop? Ron responded that they were local staffing issues. Commissioner Lutz then asked what the ratio is between local and offshore staffing? Ron responded that he wasn't sure but he would get those numbers for the Commission.

Action Item	(Commissioner Lutz)

Ron Houston, CDHS CIO, will provide the IMC with staffing ratios for the RISE project regarding local staff vs. offshore staff.

Commissioner Lutz asked where they are right now with the project's budget. Ron replies that $4.7 million is the complete project price, while $771,000.00 is what has been spent so far. Commissioner Lutz then asked what part of the project is being delivered right now versus the next few years. Ron responded that right now they are in the requirements validation stage - going through the requirements and putting together the combination of the prototype and laying out the detail of what's being developed. Commissioner Lutz pointed out that he feels it is good that they are okay with putting themselves into red status and are quick to remedy the situation before they've lost too much money.

Commissioner VanDerSchouw asked what kind of learning Ron could share since he was able to see early on that the project was in danger. Ron responded that diligence and accountability are the most important things to remember.

Commissioner Monkman asked what the status or feedback is from the federal participating agency. Ron responded that this project does not have any federal participation. John Daurio then clarified that they are somewhat involved with the Feds because the project is partially federally funded, but the Feds have not been involved in the day-to-day operations. Commissioner Monkman then asked how the project was funded. John responded that it was through RFA funds.

Chairman Picanso encouraged Ron Huston and his team to contact him if he needs any help. Ron thanked him for all of his support to this point.

III. New Business

Chairman Picanso asked the Commission for new business discussion items. No items were provided, so Chairman Picanso presented a handout summarizing the Architectural Review Scorecard (ARS). He stated the ARS handout that he had given to each of the Commissioners is a matrix of rolled-up ARS data that has been collected to-date from the agencies. He pointed out that there are 3 data points representing FY03-04, 04-05, and 05-06, and explained that the graph displays the percentage of compliance to State IT standards. Chairman Picanso complemented OIT staff for having the foresight to collect the data. He emphasized that in the area of architectural review, the trend is up and has been going up for the last few years. Chairman Picanso formally thanked all of the agencies for helping and continuing to leverage the standards.

Action Item	(Chairman Picanso)

OIT will more formally organize the Architectural Review Scorecard (ARS) data from agency DITP's and provide to the Commission.

IV. Subcommittee Readouts

A. Enterprise Architecture (EA) Subcommittee

Commissioner Mulford reported that the EA Subcommittee met this morning and that he is very encouraged with the on-going meetings of this Subcommittee. He stated they had a good discussion regarding the number of common and shared services that are coming into the State that are already in place and will be in place in the future. He emphasized that he sees great progress being made from a technical perspective and a major shift taking place in the culture of utilizing common and shared services.

Commissioner Mulford stated that currently they are looking at the Email Consolidation Project, e-FOR^{3}T disaster recovery Project, the Statewide IT Strategic Plan, portfolio management and security. He noted that they were briefed on the Capitol Complex PBX VoIP project, which impacts every element of common and shared services in the State. They also see great progress in security, Identity Management, continuity of operations, use of the Portal, etc.

Commissioner Mulford emphasized that the majority of agency CIO's are taking seriously the importance of consolidated and common and shared services. He recognized that there is work to do in the area of marketing and getting continued support, and commented that final decisions on the Email project have not been made yet; we still need to look at the financial perspective to

see if it makes sense. He commented that he believes this project will require a lot of on-going dialogue and support.

Commissioner Mulford explained that the e-FOR^{3}T Project is ahead of schedule. The Secretary of State is moving in and they are actively documenting the process and lessons learned to create Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) for agencies later on. He further noted that there might be a project close-out on this project as early as next month.

As far as the Capitol Complex PBX Network, Commissioner Mulford pointed out this is a major shift for the State, with an aggressive schedule. He stated that a contract has to be in place by October 31, 2006 because the current lease will expire. Commissioner Mulford suggested to Chairman Picanso that we schedule the project for a review in the August meeting.

Action Item	(Commissioner Mulford)

OIT request DPA's Capitol Complex VOIP Project provide a presentation to the August 2006 IMC.

Commissioner Mulford encouraged more Commissioner participation in the Subcommittee meetings the mornings prior to the full IMC. Chairman Picanso noted that the EA Subcommittee was ¾ full this morning while the Risk Management Subcommittee was standing room only. Chairman Picanso would also encourage other Commissioners to attend these meetings.

B. IT Risk Management Subcommittee

Commissioner Delmonico reported that the IT Risk Management Subcommittee met this morning and discussed details of a number of different projects. She noted that they also made some progress on the risk assessment questions that will be asked of everyone who comes into the subcommittee. She further noted that she would like to get a point where people want to come to the subcommittee when they have problems or questions so that the subcommittee can help them. She also mentioned that anyone is welcome to come and sit in on the meetings to gain more detail than is discussed at the full IMC meeting. Commissioner Delmonico added that she would like to have an MNT update. Rick Malinowski agreed to do this in September.

Action Item	(Commissioner Delmonico)

Rick Malinowski provide an update on the MNT to the IMC in the near future.

Commissioner Delmonico requested to add the following action items to the Risk Management Subcommittee: a) development of a list of executive director-level risk assessment questions, b) add earned value and other tangible factors to the project dashboard. Commissioner Delmonico stated they will be producing Minutes out of the Subcommittee. In addition, she mentioned that she would like to do a vendor scorecard since vendor selection continues to be an issue but, being a vendor herself, someone else should probably take it on.

Commissioner Lutz asked if the vendor scorecard would be pre-vendor scorecards or during the project. Commissioner Delmonico responded that she felt it should be pre-vendor scorecards. Commissioner Lutz suggested that it be part of the RFP process and also asked if they could be sent a soft copy of the IT Project Risk Assessment Questions.

Action Item   **(Commissioner Delmonico/Lutz)**

OIT email to the Commissioners the IT project Risk Assessment Questions developed by the Risk Management Subcommittee.

Commissioner Malinowski suggested that they create a cross-functional task force of representatives from various disciplines to identify the vendor scorecard. Commissioner Delmonico responded that there are vendor companies out there who do this, but she would prefer to do it internally due to cost. Commissioner Mulford commented that the Federal Government requires it already. He further commented that he learned in the EA subcommittee meeting that, with regard to procurement, if an agency wants to acquire services from another agency's contract, it's very difficult unless it becomes a statewide procurement. Commissioner Malinowski commented that part of the problem is the time it takes to do it and the value received. Commissioner Malinowski emphasized that he does not feel they would get the value for the time that it would take to procure.

Chairman Picanso commented that it is likely that this subject will come up again in the legislative session and that the IMC should be prepared to discuss it. Commissioner VanDerSchouw noted that there have been several studies on this issue and that the research has found that, in organizations like this, we tend to try and manage the exceptions and become terrible at managing 95% of the cases. He recommended a focus on being less granular and on doing the 95% well first.

Chairman Picanso announced that OIT will be acquiring 2 project managers, on a contract basis, beginning August 1, 2006. He extended a formal thank you to the OIT staff for helping with the increased workload. Chairman Picanso also introduced Georgia Frueh, OIT Staff, who is helping with administrative tasks and office management.

C. Policy / Portfolio Subcommittees

None. Meeting cancelled.

Adjournment
Chairman Picanso adjourned the meeting at 3:25 pm.

_____

The next IMC will be held on:
Friday, August 18, 2006
1:30pm – 4:00pm
Legislative Services Building – Hearing Room A
200 E. 14th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80203